

## Chapter 6: Measures and Monitoring for Gauging Progress

### *Why do we need monitoring?*

“Monitoring” is commonly considered an “extra” or unnecessary expense. This is often because the information is not generated to provide specific information to inform decisions, nor collected and analyzed in a timely manner for use by decision-makers. In fact, monitoring is a basic need when working on complex problems, like salmon conservation, with limited resources and a high degree of accountability. Linking monitoring to actions of highest importance or uncertainty provides decision-makers with data that can 1) help provide certainty that money is spent on the most critical actions, 2) show that the actions are achieving objectives, 3) describe progress towards goals, and 4) allow for course corrections if needed. The monitoring framework described in the following text, in combination with the reporting and evaluation process described in Chapter 2, is intended to ensure that information collection informs and is driven by anticipated decisions regarding priorities and resource allocation. The monitoring framework proposed in this chapter is based on Steering Committee direction, and was developed with assistance from the WRIA 8 Technical Committee.

This monitoring framework generally follows the definitions of monitoring as described in the “Statewide Strategy to Recovery Salmon” (Washington State Joint Natural Resources Cabinet, September 21, 1999). These include:

- 1) Implementation Monitoring: Are actions being implemented as planned?
- 2) Direct Effectiveness Monitoring: Are actions having the anticipated outcomes?
- 3) Cumulative Effectiveness Monitoring: Is the sum of all actions within a basin or across the watershed improving habitat and salmon population conditions?
- 4) Chinook salmon populations increasing in productivity, abundance, distribution, and diversity? What are the cause and effect relationships between actions and fish population changes?

Information gathered in a systematic and meaningful manner provides the basis for showing progress toward achieving Plan goals through the implementation of actions. There are different types of monitoring that can help show progress and support future decisions that will ensure additional progress.

- 1) **Documenting which actions were implemented and which were not** will allow decision-makers to know where additional funding, clarification, or other work is needed to completely implement the plan.

- 2) **Using a systematic, rigorous program to evaluate the success of projects in meeting specific objectives** will allow application of information from individual projects to general types of projects. Further, this will help decision-makers know the types of actions that produce results and will allow decision-makers to reduce the funding towards projects that do not produce good results.

- 3) **Monitoring changes in habitat and in survival of various life stages of Chinook** will allow regional decision-makers to make adjustments to improve the effectiveness of specific types of actions. It will reduce the risk of funding unsuccessful projects. Ultimately, it will allow decision-makers to evaluate the success of the plan actions in restoring healthy ecosystems and Chinook populations. Monitoring the status and trends of watershed conditions and aquatic habitat in a randomized approach will allow a subset of the watershed to represent trends in the overall health of the watershed. This

will require less funding than monitoring the same factors in more places around the watershed in a less systematic or strategic manner.

### ***Who else is working on monitoring?***

Many factors (harvest, hatcheries, habitat, hydropower, and ocean conditions) influence Chinook salmon populations characteristics (diversity, abundance, productivity, and distribution). The WRIA 8 plan is focused on protecting and restoring freshwater and nearshore marine habitats. Since the desired outcome is healthy Chinook populations rather than merely improving aquatic habitat, WRIA 8 efforts to monitor habitat and Chinook survival improvements will need to be linked with monitoring the effects of other actions, e.g., harvest and hatchery management, to restore Chinook populations.

#### **Individual Entities - WRIA 8 Monitoring and Research**

Local monitoring programs conducted by individual entities in WRIA 8 focusing on salmon populations, habitat utilization, predation pressures, food web interactions, thermal migration barriers, lakeshore habitat utilization by juvenile Chinook, juvenile migration timing, and other biological and ecological processes have been invaluable to the scientific strategy for WRIA 8. These programs include the City of Seattle monitoring programs for the Upper Cedar Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and shoreline studies; the Army Corp of Engineers General Investigations for the Lake Washington Watershed and Ballard Locks studies; the State and locally sponsored Sockeye Studies; NOAA Fisheries, USGS, and Seattle coho prespawn mortality investigations; and King County Chinook and habitat monitoring programs through the Wastewater and Natural Resources programs. These local monitoring programs have provided foundational data for the conservation plan. However, the current funding source for these programs is based on the individual entity's project or program needs and continued funding is uncertain beyond 2004-2005. The Technical Committee strongly endorses the continuation and financial support of smolt traps, spawner surveys, PIT tags, snorkel surveys, food web dynamics (predator-prey interactions, exotic species impacts), salmonid behavior and movement studies, and coho prespawn mortality investigations.

There have been a number of efforts to improve monitoring efforts at the regional and state levels. It will require staff and policy level discussions to determine who should take the lead and fund various elements that are common to multiple groups. Some of these efforts with potential overlap or coordination opportunities with WRIA 8 have been summarized below.

### Validation Monitoring Panel - Chinook population monitoring recommendations

The Validation Monitoring Panel, assembled by the Olympic Natural Resources Center of the University of Washington, conducted an interdisciplinary review of the various scientific issues and problems associated with monitoring Chinook salmon populations. The international panel of recognized scientific leaders reviewed various approaches to monitoring salmon populations. The focus of this effort was to evaluate the statistical design of programs monitoring genetics of salmon populations, fish productivity, and habitat requirements at various spatial and temporal scales. The panel provided recommendations for a consistent scientific framework for validation monitoring for salmon conservation efforts to federal, state, and tribal governments in the Pacific Northwest (College of Forest Resources, University of Washington. December 1, 2000). These recommendations and considerations should be followed by WRIA 8 when conducting cumulative monitoring for Chinook populations to be sure the information collected can be utilized at various spatial scales.

### Washington State Monitoring Strategy

At the direction of the Washington State Legislature in 2001 (SSB 5637), the Governor's Salmon Recovery Team led an interjurisdictional effort to improve State monitoring efforts to develop a comprehensive monitoring strategy to evaluate the success of salmon and habitat recovery actions. Reports, including "The Comprehensive Monitoring Strategy and Action Plan," are available at <http://www.governor.wa.gov/gdro/monitoring.htm>. The State is starting to implement the recommendations for monitoring the effectiveness of Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) projects this year. The State has not yet implemented a program for intensively monitoring one or more watersheds for evaluating the influence of specific habitat improvements on fish population parameters. The recommendation for using an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP, <http://www.epa.gov/emap/>) randomized sampling protocol for tracking the status and trends of watershed health at a WRIA level has also not yet been implemented. The WRIA 8 Technical Committee recommends that WRIA 8 monitoring efforts utilize the protocols recommended by the State Monitoring Oversight Committee, coordinate with the SRFB project monitoring efforts where possible, and use the EPA EMAP protocols for evaluating the status and trends in watershed condition. The Technical Committee recommends that WRIA 8 approach the Governor's Salmon Team and SRFB to incorporate WRIA 8 into the State program.

### Co-managers Monitoring Program

The Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Muckleshoot Tribe, and the Suquamish Tribe, as the state co-managers of fisheries resources in WRIA 8, conduct a variety of monitoring programs in the watershed (SSHIAP website). These programs include, but are not limited to, weekly salmon spawning index surveys in the Cedar River and Bear/Cottage Creek, adipose clipping and coded wire tagging (CWT) programs to evaluate harvest impacts and straying of hatchery fish, genetic sampling of Bear/Cottage Creek for genetic impacts from hatchery strays, adult salmon counts at the Ballard Locks, fish pathology monitoring of hatchery fish and waters, and scale analysis for aging spawning salmon. The Technical Committee recognizes that many of these monitoring efforts are currently coordinated with some monitoring programs augmented with local funds. The Technical Committee recommends the existing programs be continued and increased to complete entire spawning periods for all salmon populations within the watershed. The State has identified additional monitoring recommendations for WRIA 8 (see Appendix L). These research and monitoring

recommendations have not yet been discussed or approved by the co-managers, but are consistent with WRIA 8 Technical Committee recommendations.

#### Puget Sound Ambient Monitoring Program (PSAMP)

The Puget Sound Action Team (PSAT) coordinates monitoring efforts by federal, state, and local agencies through the Puget Sound Ambient Monitoring Program (PSAMP) to assess the trends in the environmental health of Puget Sound and evaluate the success of the Puget Sound Management Plan (<http://www.psat.wa.gov/Programs/PSAMP.htm>). The PSAT also provides staff support for the Nearshore Policy Group, who is identifying hypotheses and recovery recommendations for the Puget Sound nearshore and marine waters for the Shared Strategy for Puget Sound. The Technical Committee recommends coordinating and augmenting efforts through the PSAMP program for evaluating the status and trends for WRIA 8 marine areas.

These monitoring programs have been established for specific purposes, often not related to salmon conservation planning needs. Policy level interaction will be needed to encourage those agencies and jurisdictions to join monitoring efforts with WRIA 8. Funding may need to be secured for federal or state agencies to maintain their current level of effort or to coordinate with WRIA 8 technical staff. Technical staff will need to coordinate and develop scientifically valid means of collecting, analyzing, and storing data that can be shared between jurisdictions and agency for use at local, WRIA, or larger scales of interest.

#### **Recommended Parameters And Monitoring Timeframes**

Recommendations identified in this section have been identified as important for monitoring plan effectiveness and progress towards salmon recovery. This does not suggest that WRIA 8 jurisdictions implement and fund each recommendation, but it does imply that if WRIA 8 jurisdictions do not implement and fund them some other entity must/should. Additional work is needed to establish monitoring responsibilities between local entities and other regional, State, or Federal agencies. See table 6-1 for a summary of coordination contacts that will need to be arranged after plan actions have been more firmly identified.

The Steering Committee provided direction to staff as follows:

- Find ways to effectively and efficiently measure progress on habitat conditions and Chinook response
- Find ways to evaluate our efforts for continually improving key actions
- Utilize existing programs or efforts where available – avoid duplication of efforts
- Utilize results and coordinate with similar monitoring efforts to improve understanding of projects with uncertain outcomes
- Monitoring methods should be cost-effective; use what is measured through other means and for other purposes, where possible
- Evaluate areas of major uncertainty
- Identify endpoints and provide enough information to know when we have achieved our goals
- Information should be used to communicate progress to the public and others
- Monitoring should focus on both habitat and salmon population measures
- Watershed conditions should be evaluated at the watershed, rather than basin level
- Direct effectiveness monitoring should be focused on those actions with the most uncertainty or in uncertain environments, which mean higher risk

- Direct effectiveness measurement of educational outcomes is important
- Direct effectiveness monitoring of land use actions should be correlated to growth
- Cumulative effectiveness is the priority monitoring concern; it is important that cumulative monitoring encompass non-project actions and predation
- Link direct effectiveness monitoring efforts to cumulative monitoring efforts, if possible

### **Implementation Monitoring**

It is necessary to understand which actions were implemented, where the actions occurred, and the anticipated outcomes of the actions to evaluate the success of the plan. The implementation monitoring program will be developed after the final action elements and goals have been approved by the Steering Committee. Implementation monitoring is anticipated to be a relatively simple checklist summary that would include the type of action, the reach or basin of impact, specific objectives the action was supposed to address, and anticipated benefits of the action. Information will be collected by individual jurisdictions based on common definitions and standard forms. The type of information might include things such as:

Projects: E.g., Number of levee setbacks in reach 4 of the Cedar River, length of river affected, area of additional floodplain interaction, and amount of newly created off-channel juvenile Chinook rearing habitat.

Education: E.g., Number of lakeshore homeowner programs in Lake Washington, Section 1 (near mouth of Cedar River) on the importance of lakeshore vegetation, number of lakeshore property owners attending, hours of follow-up technical assistance, change in homeowner perspective of native vegetation along shorelines.

Land use: E.g., Number and acreage of good riparian habitat in Reach 3 (Waterways Reach E) of Bear Creek placed into protected status through native growth protection easements or other incentive programs (identified by type) or by acquisition.

The exact parameters will be established by the Technical Committee and approved by the Steering Committee after the plan is approved and implementation agreements are understood. Implementation data will be compiled and summarized annually. This information will be communicated with the participating jurisdictions and the public. In the third year after plan ratification, the oversight body will use implementation monitoring information to identify action types that are proceeding well and those action types experiencing barriers to implementation.

**Table 6-1: Entities with Potential Responsibilities for Monitoring**

<b>Type of Monitoring</b>	<b><u>Recommended Monitoring</u></b>	<b>Potential Entities to be Coordinated</b>	<b>Policy or Technical efforts needed?</b>
<b>Direct Effectiveness*</b>	1) Projects 2) Educational actions 3) Land use actions	1) Projects – local jurisdictions or project proponents, Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB), Wash. Dept. Fish & Wildlife (WDFW), Army Corp of Engineers (ACOE) 2) Local jurisdictions 3) Local jurisdictions	1) Policy & Technical 2) Technical 3) Policy & Technical
<b>Cumulative Effectiveness:*</b> <b>CHINOOK</b>	1) Smolt Trapping: 2) juvenile migration survival 3) juvenile snorkel index reaches 4) Salmon spawner surveys 5) Salmonwatcher Observations all streams	1) smolt trapping – WDFW, Muckleshoot Tribe (MIT), Seattle, King County, WRIA jurisdictions 2) PIT tagging & readers – WDFW, Seattle, ACOE, WRIA jurisdictions 3) Snorkel surveys – USFW, Seattle, Mercer Island, WDFW, WRIA jurisdictions 4) Spawner surveys – WDFW, MIT, King County, Seattle, Bellevue, WRIA jurisdictions	1) Policy & Technical 2) Policy & Technical 3) Policy & Technical 4) Policy & Technical
<b>Cumulative Effectiveness –</b> <b>Habitat</b>	1) Multi-spectral analysis 2) EMAP 3) flow gauges	1) King County, University of Washington, WRIA jurisdictions 2) King County, WRIA jurisdictions 3) US Geological Survey (USGS), local WRIA jurisdictions	1) Policy & Technical 2) Policy & Technical 3) Policy & Technical

### **Direct Effectiveness**

Direct effectiveness monitoring provides the basis for improving the design and execution of actions. Appropriate monitoring of actions will also identify unanticipated effects and evaluate whether the actions were achieving the anticipated results. Monitoring plans cannot be developed for direct effectiveness monitoring until the Conservation Plan is complete and actions have been firmly slated for implementation. Timelines for direct effectiveness monitoring may vary, but annual reviews of available information will be compiled and shared among the Technical Committee and oversight/summit bodies. The Technical Committee will have the responsibility for improving the implementation of the projects, while the Summit Committee will have the responsibility for deciding whether or not specific types of actions should continue to be funded or if some types of actions should have greater priority over others. Direct and cumulative effectiveness monitoring recommendations are summarized in Table 6-2. This table includes information about the scale of the monitoring effort (reach, basin, watershed), current funding sources, cost estimates, and opportunities for cooperation with other entities.

The State Salmon Recovery Funding Board has recently implemented direct effectiveness monitoring for State funded projects such as fish passage improvement, in-stream habitat, acquisition, riparian vegetation restoration, and in-stream diversions. The WRIA 8 Technical Committee will work with the SRFB to obtain information on the effectiveness of those types of projects and determine its relevance and usefulness in WRIA 8.

Local focus for monitoring project effectiveness will be on:

- large woody debris (LWD) projects;
- lakeshore restoration projects for vegetation restoration;
- armoring removal;
- beach augmentation or sloping projects and dock modifications;
- river levee setbacks or floodplain reconnection;
- fine sediment reduction;
- improving water quality;
- management of exotic species; and
- marine shore restoration projects.

These projects have been identified by the Technical Committee as having less certain results, either because accepted and tested standard engineering designs are not yet developed or because of increased variability in the urban habitat. WRIA 8 will utilize specific protocols and monitoring designs from the SRFB project monitoring program where applicable. Protocols and statistical designs will have to be developed for monitoring projects not covered by the SRFB program, after the projects to be implemented have been identified.

In addition to the direct effectiveness monitoring recommendation for lakeshore habitat, juvenile Chinook use of lakeshore habitat has been identified as a key uncertainty in the scientific framework. The Technical Committee recommends that evaluation of juvenile use of habitat and modified habitat be conducted annually. The current efforts for lake habitat utilization, using snorkel surveys, has been conducted by the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the City of Seattle. It is recommended that the snorkel surveys be continued using the established protocols and be reported on an annual basis.

Educational programs also need to be monitored to determine if the programs cause a change in the perceptions of the participants and if that changed perception results in the participants

making voluntary habitat improvements on their properties. There are already a number of programs in WRIA 8, such as the Natural Yard Care Program, that conduct evaluations of the impact of their programs. The WRIA 8 Outreach Committee will utilize regional and local programs such as these whenever possible to evaluate educational programs. In addition, the status and trends of the public's general awareness and perception of salmon habitat needs and salmon recovery efforts will be monitored through a professional survey every five years in conjunction with the major plan reviews. Specific hypotheses and statistical design for the monitoring plan have not yet been developed.

Land use actions will need to be monitored for their effectiveness in protecting riparian vegetation, reducing stormwater runoff, and protecting upland forests. There is currently great diversity of land use protections among the jurisdictions within the watershed. Given this diversity, the array of confounding forces, and the menu of options local jurisdictions can use to achieve the desired outcomes, it is difficult to develop direct effectiveness monitoring for each tool available. The Technical Committee recommends that the cumulative effect of the various options for riparian vegetation and upland forest protection be evaluated through sub-meter multi-spectral image analysis for vegetation and impervious surfaces. Stormwater management effectiveness will be evaluated for increase/decrease in peak/low flow and a flashiness index using flow gauging stations corrected for rainfall conditions. The flow information will be compared to WRIA 8 flow model results, as published in the Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Limiting Factors Report for the Cedar- Sammamish Basin (Water Resource Inventory Area 8). Then, the areas with the best and least success in protecting the ecological processes will be compared with the suite of implementation options used. Specific hypotheses to be tested and the statistical design of the analyses have not yet been developed.

Direct effectiveness monitoring will be conducted annually, but summarized according to the statistical design for the project. It is anticipated that some projects, such as fish passage improvement projects, will have results within one year. Others, such as levee setbacks or large woody debris projects may take three years or longer for the aquatic habitats to fully form.



Insert Table 6-2 here (11 X 17) page 1 of 3

Insert 11x17 – page 2 of 3

insert page 3 of 3

See Chapter 3. The WRIA 8 Technical Committee will work with WDFW to coordinate permit monitoring requirements with WRIA direct effectiveness monitoring designs and protocols.

## **Cumulative Effectiveness Monitoring**

### **Habitat Monitoring**

Cumulative effectiveness monitoring will be used to evaluate how multiple actions are affecting habitat condition and fish populations, and what kinds of overall adjustments in conservation priorities may be needed. This monitoring integrates the corrective actions of the plan with all the other actions in the watershed that may influence progress toward desired habitat/salmon conditions.

The scientific basis for the conservation plan utilized available multi-spectral and geographic information systems (GIS) analysis to determine large-scale habitat conditions that influence ecological processes within the watershed (see chapter 3). The current information utilized LandSat technology, at a 30-meter resolution that limited small-scale analyses. The Technical Committee recommends sub-meter level resolution multi-spectral analyses be utilized to determine percent forest cover, percent total impervious area, and riparian forest cover. The sub-meter resolution would provide the ability to detect changes in areas smaller than 30 meters, which may be necessary, especially in developed areas. This information will be used for both direct effectiveness monitoring at the jurisdiction level for land use action effectiveness and for cumulative effectiveness monitoring at the basin scale. The analysis will also include the marine shoreline areas, in addition to the stream riparian analysis. Multi-spectral analyses should be conducted on a five-year basis to correlate with WRIA major reviews and to provide information to support Growth Management Plan and other local land use plan updates.

To detect the status and future trends in aquatic condition, it is recommended that WRIA 8 implement the recommendations of the Governor's Salmon Recovery Team to implement an EPA EMAP reconnaissance of the watershed. This protocol includes diverse indicators of aquatic health, including habitat, basic water quality, macroinvertebrates, algae, and fish assemblages. EMAP protocols employ a randomized approach to sampling locations. Using this methodology would 1) allow WRIA 8 information to be "rolled up" into regional and state evaluations, 2) avoid the necessity of monitoring every mile of stream within the watershed to determine the watershed condition, 3) provide a statistically valid method of evaluating trends in a highly variable environment, and 4) allow the use of new risk assessment analytical tools for stressors to biological communities. This monitoring would allow comparisons of actions between watersheds, provide reliable information about habitat trends over time, and would provide habitat information on all types and sizes of stream within the watershed. The EMAP program would provide information necessary for a multi-species approach to habitat improvement, rather than focus on only Chinook streams, without increasing monitoring costs. Over time, EMAP monitoring would allow the evaluation of some of the key uncertainties in the EDT model and provide opportunities to continue to improve the capacity of the model. The information on habitat change in the watershed will also be needed when interpreting fish population changes. EMAP assessments should occur on an annual basis or utilized for a trend assessment every five years to coordinate with the Conservation Plan major review periods.

Marine shorelines are critical habitat for salmonids from many watersheds, so evaluating habitat conditions within WRIA nearshore marine habitats is considered critical for the both the WRIA and Environmentally Significant Unit conservation efforts. This assessment should include distance, type and location of bank armoring; number, location, and area of over-water

structures; location and area of gravel recruitment sites; condition, area, and location of stream deltas and wetlands. This monitoring should be coordinated with the Puget Sound Nearshore Program, PSAMP, and other Puget Sound marine shoreline recovery efforts.

Stream flow is a critical element for salmon recovery efforts. Flow gauging is currently conducted by local jurisdictions and USGS in rivers and streams across the watershed. A cursory review of flow gauging stations by the Technical Committee indicated that additional flow gauging stations would not likely be needed. However, a final review will be needed when developing the statistical design for the monitoring program. Local jurisdictions or USGS not maintaining existing permanent flow gauging stations could obviously also change this recommendation. Specific protocols and data management tools for sharing data from these gauges is needed. Rain gauges are also maintained by local governments and additional gauges are not likely to be needed. Flow and rain data will need to be collected and analyzed according to standard protocols on an annual basis. Annual flow reports should be prepared with a trend assessment and model comparison every five years to coordinate with the Conservation Plan major review periods. The cumulative monitoring information will be used to determine trends in basin flow conditions as compared to the baseline established in the WRIA 8 flow report included in the Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Limiting Factors Report for the Cedar- Sammamish Basin (Water Resource Inventory Area 8). The Technical Committee and oversight/summit bodies will use cumulative monitoring information by basin to determine whether additional investigations of land use actions for stormwater management, groundwater recharge protection, and water withdrawals are needed.

### **Chinook Monitoring**

The Steering Committee has advised that the WRIA should monitor Chinook response to habitat actions. The Technical Committee has also stated that monitoring various life stages of Chinook is imperative to reduce some of the key uncertainties in the scientific foundation of the plan. It is necessary to monitor more than one Chinook life history stage to determine whether freshwater habitat improvements from plan actions are improving the health of Chinook populations and to isolate influences within the watershed. The primary life stages of Chinook to be monitored are spawners, juvenile migrants from streams, juvenile migrants through the lakes and migratory corridors, and smolt use of nearshore marine areas.

Weekly Chinook spawner surveys are currently conducted by WDFW, The Muckleshoot Tribe, and local jurisdictions. The surveys are considered critical, but currently do not span the complete salmon migration season, nor survey all salmon bearing streams. It is recommended that professional surveys be conducted based on WDFW protocols for all core and satellite streams for the full migratory season. It is also recommended that scale samples be taken to identify the ages of returning Chinook. Professional spawner survey information and juveniles outmigrants from streams will be used to evaluate trends in the egg to outmigrant survival and distribution of spawning populations. While spawner surveys provide information on the abundance of Chinook, it is a synthesis of all freshwater and saltwater factors influencing the population. Using a combination of spawner surveys and smolt trapping effectively eliminates the influence of ocean conditions, harvest, and other outside influences on the Chinook population. Professional spawner survey information is currently augmented by spot observations by trained volunteers through the WRIA 8 Salmon Watcher Program (<http://dnr.metrokc.gov/wlr/waterres/salmon/index.htm>). It is recommended that this volunteer monitoring program be continued. Spot observations are useful to determine the incidence of spawner use of satellite and episodic basins. Annual spawning survey reports will need to be compiled by basin with comprehensive reviews by population every five years for the major plan

review. The five-year reviews will provide current information by population, but Chinook population response information will take the full ten-year plan implementation period.

Trapping Chinook migrating from the Cedar River and Bear Creek ("smolt trapping") is considered critical for evaluating core spawning areas for the Cedar River Chinook population and the North Lake Washington Chinook population. These trapping locations are also linked with monitoring survival through migratory areas. If the Issaquah Hatchery Chinook population becomes considered essential for recovery by NOAA Fisheries, it is recommended that Chinook migrating from Issaquah Creek be monitored. It is also desired to monitor the migrating Chinook from Kelsey Creek, a satellite basin for the North Lake Washington Chinook population. This information will be used in conjunction with spawning survey information to determine the trends of Chinook production in a satellite stream and the capacity of urbanized streams to contribute to salmon recovery. Smolt trapping information will be collected annually and used in conjunction with spawning survey information to evaluate egg to outmigrant survival, as well as trends in juvenile production, spawner to outmigrant production, and proportion of river rearing and lake rearing juveniles. While more comprehensive reviews of smolt trapping data can be conducted every five years in conjunction with the major plan reviews, as mentioned previously, longer periods of record are necessary for statistical analysis of population parameters.

Another critical element to monitor is Chinook survival in the lakes and migratory areas. Passive Integrated Transponder (PIT) tags are one technique used to evaluate juvenile migration routes and timing. They can also be used to evaluate survival rates through various migratory areas of the watershed, as long as additional samples are collected beyond the locks to evaluate sampling efficiency. This information is considered critical for determining whether actions are improving survival of lake rearing and migrating juveniles, isolating spawning habitat impacts from rearing and migratory impacts, and reducing key uncertainties in the scientific framework. PIT tags are implanted in outmigrating juvenile Chinook, which is most efficiently done in conjunction with smolt trapping. The PIT tagging work that has been done previously has been funded and managed by the Army Corp of Engineers (ACOE) and the City of Seattle. This work has been a combination of intensive monitoring, which is necessary for determining migratory routes and survival, and less intensive monitoring, which primarily evaluates timing from the streams to the locks. PIT tag results should be summarized annually, with trend assessment conducted in concert with the major five-year plan review.

The Technical Committee recommends continuing snorkel surveys in Lake Washington to provide abundance of fry in different index reaches of the lake. This information will be used to determine trends in habitat use, juvenile abundance, and lake migration timing. Effectiveness monitoring efforts for lake habitat modifications could be used to offset or augment index surveys (Tabor, 2002).

Another key uncertainty in the scientific framework is changes in lake food web dynamics. There have been numerous efforts to evaluate components of the Lake Washington food web dynamics through the Lake Washington Sockeye Studies, University of Washington research, and WDFW warm water fish studies. WDFW has scheduled a full warm water species survey of Lake Washington for 2004. This effort would be invaluable in determining population status of resident native and exotic species. This type of full lake survey should be done on a periodic basis to evaluate trends in predator and prey species as habitat conditions are changed. The frequency and design of this trend assessment has not yet been established.

### **Validation Monitoring**

Identifying trends in population parameters for use in delisting Chinook from the Endangered Species Act is considered by the Technical Committee to be beyond the scope of WRIA 8. However, the cumulative monitoring efforts should be accomplished in a manner that would assist other entities in validation monitoring. A method for coordinating monitoring efforts at the Puget Sound scale should be developed. It is possible that the Shared Strategy for Puget Sound may be able to assist with this function.

### **Coordination of Monitoring Efforts**

Given the diverse group of entities monitoring elements of habitat and salmon recovery, it will be imperative to develop a plan to coordinate actions across jurisdictions. It will require both political and technical communications to determine who is the appropriate entity to conduct protocol development and training, field work and equipment maintenance, quality assurance and control, data management and analyses, coordination and scheduling, and reporting. Table 6-2 summarizes recommendations for WRIA 8 monitoring and entities currently or potentially involved in these monitoring activities.

### **Draft Interim Goals**

In order for monitoring to be most useful for adaptive management, the information has to be linked to management decisions. As identified in chapter 3, the Technical Committee has suggested a number of interim goals based on the Viable Salmon Population (VSP) guidance from the National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries formerly known as National Marine Fisheries Service (McElhany et al, June 2000). NOAA Fisheries has identified four parameters that will be used to evaluate population viability status. These are diversity, abundance, productivity, and distribution. During the major review periods, the Technical Committee will review the information collected through the cumulative monitoring program and compare results to the interim goals to see whether the habitat improvements are having the anticipated effects and are occurring at the desired rate of improvement. The summit body will review this information from the Technical Committee to determine whether an alteration to the focus or funding of the plan is warranted.

### **Next Steps**

The Steering Committee will recommend the level and types of monitoring to be included in the plan. These recommendations will be reviewed and adopted or modified by the WRIA 8 Forum.

The Steering Committee and Technical Committee will need to approach other entities involved in monitoring, such as the Shared Strategy, federal and state agencies, local jurisdictions, SRFB, and ACOE to secure their commitment to perform monitoring activities. A strategy to determine responsibilities for various elements of monitoring habitat and salmon recovery will need to be developed for both technical and policy issues (See table 6-1).

Once the plan and monitoring elements are approved, the Technical Committee will develop specific hypotheses to be tested and design statistically valid monitoring plans for each monitoring element included in the plan.

There are currently no common protocols, training, equipment, database, data management, data analysis, or data sharing across jurisdictions. These issues are currently substantial barriers to a WRIA monitoring program, especially if conducted through individual jurisdiction efforts. If the monitoring is to be conducted by a combination of individual jurisdiction efforts

and outside entities, the difficulties will be increased. This effort will require a focused work program and local jurisdiction commitment to developing a regional monitoring agreement and support structure.

There is no database available in which to compile regional monitoring data. This will require additional technical resources to define the needs and costs of database development and management.

### **Assumptions**

These recommendations assume that local jurisdictions will continue to staff an interdisciplinary technical team at a sufficient level to provide statistical design, quality assurance, data analysis, and other functions identified as Technical Team responsibilities.

It is assumed that the schedule will provide Technical Committee, Oversight Committee, and Summit Committee adequate time to review and understand monitoring information before decisions need to be made.

### **References and Additional Information**

Army Corp of Engineers. 2002 presentation on Lake Washington Ship Canal General Investigations studies.

[http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/publicmenu/DOCUMENTS/LindaSmith\\_pres.pdf](http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/publicmenu/DOCUMENTS/LindaSmith_pres.pdf)

Botkin, D.B., D.L. Peterson, and J.M. Calhoun (technical editors). 2000. The Scientific Basis for Validation Monitoring of Salmon for Conservation and Restoration Plans. Olympic Natural Resources Center Technical Report. University of Washington, Olympic Natural Resources Center, Forks, Washington, USA.

City of Seattle, Cedar River Habitat Conservation Plan.

[http://www.seattle.gov/util/About\\_SPU/Water\\_System/Habitat\\_Conservation\\_Plan--HCP/index.asp](http://www.seattle.gov/util/About_SPU/Water_System/Habitat_Conservation_Plan--HCP/index.asp)

Environmental Protection Agency. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP) <http://www.epa.gov/emap/html/about.html>

Kerwin, J., 2001. Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Limiting Factors Report for the Cedar-Sammamish Basin (Water Resource Inventory Area 8). Washington Conservation Commission. Olympia, WA

Lazorchak JM, Hill BH, Averill DK, Peck DV, Klemm DJ, editors. 2000. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program-Surface Waters: Field operations and methods for measuring the ecological condition of non-wadeable rivers and streams. Cincinnati (OH): U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Report nr EPA/620/R-00/007. 204 p.

McElhany, Paul; Mary H. Ruckelshaus, Michael J. Ford; Thomas C. Wainwright, and Eric P. Bjorkstedt. June 2000. Viable Salmonid Populations and the Recovery of Evolutionary Significant Units. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC 42.

Monitoring Oversight Committee. December 2002. The Washington Comprehensive Monitoring Strategy and Action Plan for Watershed Health and Salmon Recovery.



Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission. Salmon Steelhead habitat Inventory and Assessment Program (SSHIAP). <http://www.nwifc.wa.gov/sshiap2/index.asp>

Paul JF, Holland AF, Summers JK, Schimmel SC, Scott KJ. 1991. EPA's Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program: An ecological status and trends program. In: Volume 1774, Canadian Technical Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences. Report nr EPA/600/A-94/003. 80-99 p.

Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Inventory and Assessment Program (SSHIAP).  
<http://www.nwifc.wa.gov/sshiap2/index.asp>

Tabor, Roger, Julie A Scheurer, Howard A. Gearns, and Eric P. Bixler. 2002. Nearshore Habitat Use by Juvenile Chinook Salmon in the Lentic Systems of the Lake Washington Basin. Annual Report. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Salmonscape GIS information.  
<https://fortress.wa.gov/dfw/salmonscape/>

Washington Department of Ecology. Puget Sound Ambient Monitoring Program (PSAMP)  
<http://wdfw.wa.gov/fish/psamp/>